REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-28 have been canceled without prejudice. The claims have been recast as new claims 29-56. Therefore claims 29-56 are now presented for examination.

Claim Objections and Rejections

Claims 14-15 stand objected to for informalities. Claims 1, 10, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The new claims are based on the originally filed claims 1-28 with the prior amendments removed and different amendments in their place. The claims are presented as new claims to ease readability. With these new claims, these rejections and objections are believed to be traversed.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The pending claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 14-15, 17-20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barber et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,240,521, ("Barber"), in view of Ditzik, U.S. Patent No. 5,983,073, ("Ditzik"), and further in view of Kabelshkov, U.S. Patent No. 6,108,663 ("Kabelshkov"), and Hollon Jr., U.S. Patent No. 5,768,164 ("Hollon"). Applicants appreciate the thorough consideration of the application and the many references. Applicants further appreciate the care that went into the grounds for rejection in the latest Office action. Relying on that work, Applicants shall attempt to map these rejections to the new claims and explain how the new claims are believed to be allowable.

Claim 38 includes features that may be considered to be present in most of the many references cited by the Examiner. Barber and Kabelshkov show computing systems with two processors or at least two processor cores however, these operate on the same data and communicate through the same I/O system. In Claim 38, the low-power subsystem has its own independent user interface (see e.g. 115, 117 of Figure 1b and paragraphs 11-15 of the originally filed application) to provide access to the computer system through the processor of the low power subsystem.

This is not a simple or obvious change but provides functionality not contemplated by the references. In Barber, the two processors can be switched to save power, but the primary user interface must always be used. This does not provide any of the convenience discussed in the current application. In a folding notebook computer application, the computer must always be unfolded and the large power hungry screen must be activated. Kabelshkov is not concerned with power saving but with speeding up data retrieval with a co-processor.

In addition, Claim 38 recites a shared database used by both the low-power subsystem and the computer system. In both Barber and Kabelshkov, there is no separate shared database. Both processors use the one system memory. In both references, there is no access to the main system through a shared database because there is only one user interface and only one system memory.

Hollon shows a small external user interface (screen and buttons) in Figure 2 that can be used when the notebook computer is folded. However, as shown in Figures 8 and 9, the "spontaneous use display" uses the same CPU, video controller and main memory as the main display and keyboard. ASIC 84 is used to map pixels of the main display to

the "spontaneous use display." Accordingly there is no low power subsystem and no shared database coupled to both.

Ditzik shows a large number of features and many different embodiments. Rather than analyze the entire reference, Applicants refer to possible low power subsystems. The parts in Ditzik would seem to be a keyboard/computer module, a display module, a cell phone module and an earset. The keyboard/computer module would seem to be the high power system. The display module does not seem to have any processing capability but is only a display or touchscreen. The cell phone module has its own user interface and likely its own processor. However, the cell phone only uses the keyboard/computer/display portion as a higher power radio relay (see e.g. Column 8, lines 38-58, Column 13, lines 19-29). Applicants are unable to find any suggestion that the cell phone may be used to provide access to the keyboard/computer module through the cell phone's processor and a shared database. The only access would be to its antenna. Similarly the earset seems to be used only as an earset for cell phone calls and not as access to the computer system. In short, Ditzik shows a bundle of components that are all used for doing just what those components were used for doing in 1997. The only synergy is in packaging and sharing antennas.

Applicants have addressed four references individually and explained that new Claim 38 distinguishes over each of them. The combination of the four references fares no better. First of all, none of the references show a shared database that allows access to a computer system from an independent user interface. In Barber, Kableshkov, and Hollon, there is only the main computer system database, not a shared database. In Ditzik, the cell phone has its own memory but this does not provide access to the keyboard/computer module.

The remarks above have been directed to Claim 38 specifically but the remaining claims are believed to be allowable on similar grounds.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: June 1, 2005

Gordon R. Lindeen III
Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980